

## ANIMAL HUSBANDRY DEPARTMENT

The 30th April, 1979

No. 4137-AH (3)-79/13879.—The result of the Departmental Examination in Accounts held in February, 1979, is declared as under :—

Serial No.	Roll No.	Name of the Officer	Remarks
Sarvshri—			
1	161	Y. K. Bhatnagar, V. S., RAIC, Ambala Cantt.	Pass
2	162	Ishwar Singh Narwal, V. S., C. V. H., Baroda (Sonepat)	Pass
3	163	Maha Singh Sandhu, V. S., SFDA/MFAL, Rohtak	Fail
4	164	Randhir Singh, Livestock Officer, G. L. F., Hissar	Pass
5	165	Hans Raj, V. S., C. V. H., Shekhupura, Mandhuri (Karnal)	Pass
6	166	Ishwar Singh Panghal, V. S., C. V. H., Jawan (Gurgaon)	Pass
7	167	Naresh Sharma, V. S., D. P. A. P., Narnaul	Pass
8	168	Ram Kishan Nain, V. S., C. V. H., Mundis Khera (M. Garh)	Fail
9	169	Ghansham Dass, G. D. O., Haryana, Chandigarh.	Pass
10	170	Hardev Singh Bhyan, V. S., D. P. A. P., Narnaul	Fail
11	171	Om Parkash Hasija, V. S., C. V. H., Sisai (Hissar)	Fail
12	172	Sohan Lal Bajia, V. S., C. V. H., Agroha	Fail
13	173	Sewak Singh, Deputy Superintendent, G. L. F., Hissar	Pass
14	174	Om Parkash Yadav, V. S., D. P. A. P., Narnaul	Pass
15	175	Devki Nandan, V. S., Sheep and Wool Extension Centre, Khedar	Fail
16	176	Satya Pal Pawar, V. S., D. P. A. P., Rohtak.	Fail

Serial No.	Roll No.	Name of the Officer	Remarks
17	177	Rama Nand Sharma, V. S., D. P. A. P., Narnaul	Pass
18	178	Manvir Singh, V. S., CHV, Kairu	Fail
19	179	Jaivir Kumar Jain, V. S., D. P. A. P., Rohtak	Fail
20	180	P. L. Gera, V. S., A. I. C., Jhajjar (Rohtak)	Pass
21	181	Narain Sahu, R. V. S., C. V. H., Panipat	Fail
22	182	Ram Narain, V. S., C. V. H., Kachhwa	Fail
23	183	Ashok Kumar Gulati, V. S. C., V. H., Kunjpora (Karnal)	Fail
24	184	Mehtab Singh, V. S., R. A. T. C., Charkhi Dadri	Fail

No. 4137-AH(3)-79/13882.—The result of the Departmental Examination in Departmental Rules held in February, 1979, is declared as under :—

Serial No.	Roll No.	Name of the Officer	Remarks
<i>Sarvshri—</i>			
1	201	Narain Sahu, R. V. S., C. V. H., Panipat	Fail
2	202	Randhir Singh, Live Stock Officer, G. L. F. Hissar	Pass
3	203	Sewak Singh, Deputy Superintenden G. L. F. Hissar	Pass
4	204	Hari Krishan Sood, S. D. O. (A. H.), Narnaul	Pass (with credit)
5	205	Sohan Lal Bajia, V. S., C. V. H. Agroha (Rohtak)	Fail
6	206	Maha Singh Sandhu, SFDA/MFAL, Rohtak	Pass
7	207	Ashok Kumar Gulati, V. S., C. V. H., Kunjpora	Pass
8	208	Kanwar Singh Yadav, Assistant Director, D. P. A. P., Narnaul	Pass
9	209	Rama Nand Sharma, V. S., D. P. A. P., Narnaul	Pass
10	210	Ravinder Kumar, V. S., D. P. A. P., Narnaul	Pass

Serial No.	Roll No.	Name of the Officer	Remarks
11	211	Naresh Sharma, V. S. D.P. A. P., Narnaul	Fail
12	212	Hardev Singh Bhyan, D. P. A. P., Narnaul	Fail
13	213	Prem Kumar Nohria, V. S. C. V. H., Sector 25, Chandigarh	Fail
14	214	Ram Narain, V. S. C. V. H., Kachhwa	Pass
15	215	Jagan Nath Sethi, S. D. O. (AH), Rohtak	Pass (with Credit)
16	216	Mohinder Singh, V. S. CVH, Mundlana (Sonepat)	Pass
17	217	Ram Kishan Nain, V. S. CVH, Mundra Khera	Pass
18	218	Jaivir Kumar Jain, V. S. D. P. A. P., Rohtak	Pass
19	219	Satya Narain Garg, V. S., Headquarter, Directorate of Animal Husbandry, Haryana	Pass
20	220	Satya Paul Pawar, D. P. A. P., Rohtak	Pass
21	221	M. S. Tyagi, V. S. C. V. H., Chhachhrauli (Ambala)	Pass
22	222	Jagdish Chander Jaglan, V. S. D. P. A. P., Narnaul	Pass
23	223	Manvir Singh, V. S. C. V. H., Kairu (Bhiwani)	Pass

KULWANT SINGH,  
Commissioner and Secy.

#### LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 30th April, 1979

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/4471.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Milk Plant Rohtak :—

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 252 of 1978

*between*

SHRI KIRPA RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MILK PLANT,  
ROHTAK

*Present :—*

Shri Tek Chander for the workman and Shri Kirpa Ram workman in person.  
Shri R. P. Dagar for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. ID/RTK/509-78/41028, dated 11th September, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Milk Plant, Rohtak and its workman Shri Kirpa Ram, to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (4) of the sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Kirpa Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman filed his claim statement and the management wanted time for filing their written statement. On 21st February, 1979, the management filed a copy of the order of management cancelling the termination orders of the workman and the workman filed an application stating that the disputes between the parties have been settled and he withdrew the case. Today the workman appeared and made a statement that—

“My termination orders have been cancelled and I have been taken back on duty. I have already joined my duties on 25th February, 1979 on my re-instatement. Since in between period has been treated as period of leave of the kind due to me, I do not seek any further relief so far as this reference is concerned, and the same may be filed.”

In view of the above statement, I give my award as per terms of settlement and hold that the termination of services of the workman was not justified and the period from the date of termination to 22nd February, 1979 may be treated as period of leave as may be due to him with continuity of his services.

BABU RAM GOYAL,,

Dated, the 5th February, 1979.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endst. No. Ref. No. 252/78/824, dated the 17th April, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112) 3 Lab-79/4575.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and management of M/s Managing Director, Haryana State Coop. Land Development Bank Ltd., Chandigarh (ii) The Manager, Jind Primary Coop. Land Development Bank, Jind:—

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA ROHTAK

Reference No. 105 of 1978

*between*

SHRI BALKAR SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MANAGING DIRECTOR,  
HARYANA STATE COOP. LAND DEVELOPMENT BANK LTD., CHANDIGARH (II) THE  
MANAGER, JIND PRIMARY COOP. LAND DEVELOPMENT BANK, JIND.

*Present:—*

Shri Sagar Ram Gupta for the workman with workman.

Shri Manphool Singh for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. KNL/531-77/26117, dated the 16th June, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of M/s Managing Director, Haryana State Coop. Land Development Bank Ltd., Chandigarh (ii) The Manager, Jind Primary Coop. Land Bank, Jind and its workman Shri Balkar Singh to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the I. D. Act:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Balkar Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled.

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties filed their pleadings. The case was fixed for 9th April, 1979 for framing issues and on that day the workman filed an application withdrawing his claim and made the following statement.

"I have been taken back on duty by the management since 6th March, 1979 and I have joined my duties on that day. For the in-between period of termination and rejoining, I do not claim any compensation of wages. The Reference may be filed."

In view of the statement of the workman I answer the reference and give my award that the termination of the services of the workman by the management was not justified but in view of the fact that the management has taken the workman back on duty and the workman has foregone his claim for any compensation for the in-between period of the termination of services, i. e., 30th July, 1977 to 6th March, 1979. I hold that he is not entitled to any further relief.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Dated, the 16th April, 1979.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endst. No. Ref. 105, of 1978/855 dated 20th April, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)3Lab-79/4576.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between Shri Ram Dularey workman and the management of M/s Laj Industries, Chhachhroli Gate, Jagadhari:—

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 108 of 1977

*between*

SHRI RAM DULAREY WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S LAJ INDUSTRIES,  
CHHACHHROLI GATE JAGADHRY

*Present :—*

Dr. Surinder Kumar for the workman.

Shri Subhash Chander for the management.

## AWARD

By order of number JD/Amb/366-77/43441, dated 3rd October, 1977, the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of M/s Laj Industries, Chhachhroli Gate, Jagadhari

and its workman Shri Ram Dularey to this court, for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clauses (d) of the sub-section (1) of the section 10 of the I. D. Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Dularey was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties filed their pleadings and on the Pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed by my learned predecessor on 23rd August, 1978 and fixed the case for evidence of the management on 28th September, 1978:—

1. Whether the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order?

2. If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The parties obtained dates for negotiations and on 22nd November, 1978 authorised representative for the workman made a statement that the workman has entered into a settlement with the management and the management has satisfied the claim of the workman and he withdrew the claim."

In view of the statement of authorised representative of the workman, I answer the reference that the termination of the services of the workman was justified and in order and he is not entitled to any further relief.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Dated, the 16th April, 1979.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endst. No. Ref. No. 108 of 77/856, dated 20th April, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the I. D. Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)3 Lab-79/4577.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Hindustan Gum and Chemicals Ltd., Bhiwani.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 120 of 1978

*between*

SHRI MANEK LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HINDUSTAN  
GUM AND CHEMICALS LTD., BHIWANI

*Present. —*

Shri Bal Kishan Gupta for the workman.

Shri S. L. Sorana for the management.

AWARD

By order No. FD/16-N-78/30806, dated 4th July, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of M/s Hindustan Gum and Chemicals Ltd., Bhiwani and its workman Shri Manek Lal to this court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (i) of the section 10 of the I. D. Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Manek Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared on 28th August, 1978 and stated that the parties have settled their claim. On 17th October, 1978, the representative of the workman made the statement :—

“That Manek Lal workman has arrived at mutual settlement with the management. The workman does not want to pursue his claim and the reference may be filled.”

In these circumstances, this reference is filed and I answer the reference that termination of services of Shri Manek Lal was justified and in order and he is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated, the 16th April, 1979.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. Reference No. 120 of 78/857. dated the 20th April, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the I. D. Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/4578.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Jamuna Textiles, Jagadhri :—

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 68 of 1976

between

SHRI SURJAN SINGH, YADAV, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. JAMUNA  
TEXTILES, JAGADHRI

Present :—

Shri Madhu Sudan for the workman.

Shri Subhash Chand for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. AMB/465-A-76/29207, dated 10th August, 1976, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following disputes between the management of M/s. Jamuna Textiles, Jagadhri and its workmen Shri Surjan Singh, to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Surjan Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties filed their pleadings, on the basis of which my Learned predecessor framed the following issues on 26th May, 1977 and fixed the case for evidence of the management for 26th July, 1977:—

1. Whether the reference is bad in law for the preliminary objection mentioned in the written statement?
2. Whether the workman resigned his job on 7th May, 1976 and his resignation was duly accepted and the order of acceptance of the resignation were duly conveyed to him?
3. If not as per reference?

4. In case of non-proof of issue Nos. 2 and 3, whether the management is not responsible for satisfaction of the benefits arising in favour of the workman for his services with the previous management prior to 15th October, 1971 ?

The case dragged on for evidence of the management upto 22nd November, 1978 for one reason or the other. On 22nd November, 1978, the representative of the workman Shri Madhu Sudan who had been conducting the case on behalf of the workman stated that the dispute of the workman with the respondent-management has been settled and the workman does not want to pursue the case. As such, I answer the reference that termination of services of the workman was justified and in order and he is not entitled to any further relief.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Dated, the 6th April, 1979.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endst. No. 68/76/858, dated 20th April, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/4579.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Dalmia Dadri Cement Ltd., Charkhi Dadri:—

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, \*PRESIDING OFFICER LABOUR COURT  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 250 of 1978

between

SHRI SATBIR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S DALMIA

DADRI CEMENT LTD., CHARKHI DADRI

Present:—

Shri Satbir Singh, workman, in person with Shri Jagdish Rai Bagla.  
Shri O. P. Gupta, for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/HSR/17-N-78/40802 of dated 8th September, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Dalmia Dadri Cement Factory, Dadri and its workman Sh. Satbir Singh to this court, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of the sub-section (1) of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Satbir Singh was justified and in order?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared on 25th December, 1978, filed a copy of the settlement arrived at between the parties on 12th November, 1978, as per terms of the settlement, the management as a gesture of good will agreed to pay Rs. 200/- only to the workman as an *ex-gratia* payment and arrived at an amicable settlement as under:—

1. Management has agreed to take Shri Satbir Singh in employment as Gangman with a basic salary of Rs. 260 PM in 'E' Grade plus other allowances as are admissible under the Recommendations of the Cement Wages Board with effect from 1st November, 1978. However, for the purpose of computing the benefit of gratuity 1st January, 1975 will be treated and reckoned as the date. He will get next graded annual increment on 1st November, 1979 and then after every year.



2. Shri Satbir Singh has agreed not to raise any dispute before any Court or authority under any Act or law involving financial repercussions for the period prior to 1st November, 1978.
3. It has also been agreed further that Shri Satbir Singh will be retired from the service after attaining the age of 58 years. However, this age will be extendable for 2 years i. e. up to 60 years and too only when the workman remains physically and mentally fit for work. Shri Satbir Singh will give a proof of his age to the management and fillup the employment Form.

The parties requested my predecessor to file this reference on the basis of the settlement arrived at between the parties. I have satisfied myself that the settlement is just and in order and in keeping with the harmony in industrial relations, I answer the award that the termination of services of Shri Satbir Singh workman was not justified but in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties on 12th November, 1978. The workman is not entitled to any further relief as the parties are bound by the terms of the settlement.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Dated 16th April, 1979.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. Reference No. 250/78/859, dated the 20th April, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3 Lab-79/4580.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Textiles Rohtak.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 142 of 1977

*between*

SHRIMATI KANTA DEVI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. HARYANA  
TEXTILES, ROHTAK

*Present.—*

Shrimati Kanta Devi applicant in person.

Shri Roshan Lal with Shri K. S. Bhatnagar for the respondent.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/48175, dated 15th November, 1977, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Haryana Textiles, Rohtak and its workman Shrimati Kanta Devi, to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shrimati Kanta Devi was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is she entitled?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties filed their pleadings and on the pleadings of the following issues were framed by my predecessor on 4th April 1978

- (1) Whether the workman absented herself from duties from 1st March, 1977 to 24th March, 1977? if yes what effect?

## 2. As per relief ?

And fixed the case for 2nd May, 1978. The representative for the parties kept on getting adjournments without producing any evidence, ultimately on 4th October, 1978 the parties arrived at settlement where by the claim of the workman for reinstatement and gratuity etc. inclusive of all benefits was settled on payment of Rs 600 to the workman. The parties wanted time for effecting payment and on 2nd January, 1979 the management paid Rs 600 to Shrimati Kanta Devi, workman in the Court and she withdrew her claim.

In these circumstances I answer this reference that no dispute regarding termination of services of the workman remains outstanding and the workman is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated 16th April, 1979.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorcement No.      Refrence No. 142 of 77/860, dated 20th April, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana of Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)3Lab-79/4581.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Organe Chemical Industries, Sonapat.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 68 of 1978

between

SHRI RAM KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ORGANE  
CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES, SONEPAT

Present.—

Shri Ram Sarup, General Secretary, for the workman.

No one, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/RTK/28-B-78/17682, dated 9th May, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of M/s Organe Chemical Industries, Sonapat and its workman Shri Ram Kumar to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of the sub-section (1) of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Kumar was justified and in order ?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of order of references, notices were issued to the parties. The parties filed their pleadings and on their pleadings the following issues were framed in this case by my predecessor on 31st August, 1978 :—

- (1) Whether the workman tendered the resignation voluntarily and the same was accepted by the management (OPM) ?
- (2) Whether the workman raised a demand directly with the management ? If not, to what effect ?

(3) If issue No. 1 is not proved in favour of the management, whether the dismissal of the workman was justified and in order ?

(4) If not to what relief is he entitled ?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management on issue No. 1 and 3 on 5th October, 1978. The management took couple of adjournments but did not produce evidence and on the failure to appear before the Court. *Ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the management on 14th October, 1978. The management moved for setting aside *ex parte* proceedings which was set aside by the order of my predecessor dated 18th January, 1979 on payment of cost of Rs 30. Another adjournment was given to the management on payment of costs for failure to produce their evidence. On 1st March, 1979 the management filed settlement arrived at between the parties which was taken up for consideration on 28th March, 1979. On the date fixed in this case the authorised representative for the workman Shri Ram Sarup stated that settlement has taken place between the workman and the management and the workman does not want to pursue his reference and requested for filing this reference. On the basis of the settlement the workman received the following amount in full and final settlement of all his dues in respect of wages, service compensation, bonus, gratuity etc. and the workman relinquished his right to re-instatement :—

	Rs.
(i) Bonus for 1970 ..	215.00
(ii) Payment of leave with wages ..	57.00
(iii) Service compensation ..	1,828.00
Total ..	<u>2,100.00</u>

The settlement has been signed by the workman and authorised representative Shri Y. D. Vashishta for the management and witnessed by Shri Ram Sarup Kalra who is also authorised representative for the workman and one Shri Ved Singh, village Bhatgeon on 26th February, 1979.

In view of this settlement I am satisfied that a fair settlement has been arrived at by the parties and I answer the award that no further action is required to be taken in this reference and the termination of services of Shri Ram Kumar, workman is justified and in order and the workman is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated the 31st March, 1979.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. Ref. 68/78/861, dated the 20th April, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/4583.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Ranuka Metal Industries, Jagadhri.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 25 of 1978

between

SHRI LACHMAN DASS, SHRI SEWA RAM, KRISHAN LAL, ROSHAN LAL, SHRI  
PARAMJIT, SHRI RAM KISHAN, SON OF SHRI PATHU, RAM KISHAN,  
SHAM KUMAR, SHRI JASMER LAL AND SHRI SAT PARKASH  
AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S RANUKA METAL  
INDUSTRIES, JAGADHRI

Present :—

Shri Rajeshwer, for the workmen.

Shri Subhash Chander, for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. ID/Amb./640-77/6689, dated 13th February, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Ranuka Metal Industries, Jagadhri and its workmen Sarvshri Lachman Dass, Seva Ram, Krishan Lal, Roshan Lal, Paramjit, Ram Kishan, son of Pathu, Ram Kishan, Sham Kumar, Jasmer Lal and Sat Parkash, to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Sarvshri Lachman Dass, Sewa Ram, Krishan Lal, Roshan Lal, Paramjit, Ram Kishan, son of Pathu, Ram Kishan, Sham Kumar, Jasmer Lal and Sat Parkash, were justified and in order? If not, to what relief are they entitled?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workmen filed their claim statement. The case was adjourned on 27th September, 1978 for filing the written statement by the management on 25th October, 1978 both the parties contended that negotiations for settlement were going on and they wanted time. After some deliberations the parties arrived at a compromise and on 21st March, 1979 both the representative of the workmen and the management made a statement :—

“That they have arrived at a compromise and appointed Shri Bhagwat Parshad Gupta an Iron Merchant of Jagadhri as sole arbitrator to decide the dispute between the workmen and the management. It was also agreed that the decision of the arbitrator shall be final and binding on both the parties.”

In view of the compromise and the statement made on 21st March, 1979 before me I answer this reference and give my award that the parties have arrived at their own settlement for arbitration and have requested for filing this reference, therefore, no finding needed be given as to whether termination of services were justified and in order or not.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Dated 16th April, 1979.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. Ref. 25 of 78/850, dated 20th April, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/4584.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Vikas Agro Engineering Private Ltd., Mohindergarh.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 11 of 1977

between

SHRI NAR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. VIKAS AGRO  
ENGINEERING PRIVATE LTD., MOHINDERGARH

Present.—Rajender Singh, for the workman.

Nemo, for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. ID/DK/176-D-77/19980, dated 20th May, 1977, the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of M/s. Vikas Agro Engineering Private Ltd., Mohindergarh

and the workman of Shri Nar Singh to this court, for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of the sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Nar Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman filed his Claim Statement but the management did not file any written statement. On 8th July, 1977 no one appeared from the management side and *ex-parte* proceedings against the management were ordered by my predecessor, and case fixed for 16th August, 1977 for *ex-parte* evidence of the workman. The case was adjourned to numerous dates and on 9th December, 1977 the management filed an application for re-opening the case as a matter of fact this application was treated as an application or setting aside *ex-parte* proceedings against the management and notice of application was given to the workman to come up on 17th November, 1978 for which date the case was already fixed for *ex-parte* evidence of the workman. On 17th November, 1978 again no one appeared on behalf of the management and again *ex-parte* proceedings were ordered against the management. The workman was given as many as 16 adjournments for producing *ex-parte* evidence but the workman failed to appear. As a matter of fact the workman never appeared before this court and the claim statement was also filed by Shri Rajender Singh Dhaliya authorised representative of the workman. On 11th April, 1979 Mr. Rajender Singh made the following statement :

"That the workman has been informed a number of time but he is not taking interest in this case and is not coming forward. This case may be filed."

In view of the statement of authorised representative for the workman and the opportunity afforded to the workman from 8th July, 1977 to 11th April, 1979 I answer this reference and give my award that the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order. The workman is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated 10th April, 1979.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 11 of 1977/851, dated 20th April, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11 (112) 3Lab-79/4585.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Hindustan Gum and Chemical Ltd., Bhiwani.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 304 of 1978  
between

SHRI MAHAVIR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HINDUSTAN  
GUM CHEMICAL LTD., BHIWANI

Present —

Shri Bal Kishan, for the workman

Shri S. L. Surana, for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. ID/HSR/58-78/49290, dated 3rd November, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Hindustan Gum and Ltd., Bhawani and its workman, Shri Mahavir to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Mahavir was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. And the parties appeared. The management filed photostat copy of the settlement dated 20th January, 1979 and arrived at between the management and the workman on 20th January, 1979 on the basis of the settlement at S. No. 1 it is stated that the management agrees to reinstate Shri Mahavir with immediate effect as worker and the workman (Shri Mahavir) has agreed to withdraw his Demand Notice separately, served under "section 2 (a) of the Industrial Disputes Act, pending before the authority including Labour Court. Shri Bal Kishan representative of the workman made a statement on 9th April, 1979 "That the workman has been taken back on duty as per settlement. He does not want to pursue the case and the same may be filed."

In view of the statement I answer this reference and give my award that the termination of services of the workman Shri Mahavir was not justified and in order as he has been reinstated on the terms of settlement dated 20th January, 1979. He is not entitled to any further relief.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Dated the 16th April, 1979.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endst. No. Ref. 304 of 78/852, dated the 20th April, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3 Lab-79/4586.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Mohta Electro Steel, Ltd., Bhiwani.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No 313 of 1978

between

SHRI SATBIR SINGH JATTU, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF  
M/S MOHTA ELECTRO STEEL LTD., BHIWANI,

Present :—

Shri Bal Kishan, for the workmen.

Shri K. B. F. Manager, for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. ID/HSR/64-78/52360, dated the 28th November, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Mohta Electro Steel Ltd., Bhiwani and

its workman Shri Satbir Singh to this court, for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the I. D. Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Satbir Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties and the management filed a Photostat copy of the settlement arrived at between the parties on 6th December, 1978 which disclosed that the workman has received his full claim in respect of termination of services of the workman and received Rs 650 in full and final settlement of his claim. The authorised representative of the workman made the following statement on 9th April, 1979 :—

"The workman has received Rs 650, in full and final settlement claim and he does not press his claim for reinstatement or any other claim. The reference may be filed."

In view of the statement referred above I answer this reference and I give my award that the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order and in view of the receipt of the amount of Rs 650 as full and final settlement of his claim. I hold that he is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated the 16th April, 1979.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. Reference No. 313 of 78/853, dated the 20th April, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and employment Department, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the I. D. Act.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112) 3Lab-79/4587.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1949, (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Prabhat Theatre, Bhiwani.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 28 of 1978

between

SHRI BALBIR SINGH WORKMAN AND MANAGER, PARBHAT THEATRE BHIWANI

Present—

Workman in person.

Shri A. K. Bidhi, for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/HSR/681-77/6899, dated 14th February, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of Manager, Parbhat Theatre Bhiwani and its workman Shri Balbir Singh to this court, for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Balbir Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and stated that negotiation for mutual settlement were going on between the parties and they wanted some time. Numerous adjournments were granted for this purpose. And ultimately on 9th April, 1979, the workman made statement that—

"He is likely to get some better job and he does not want to join back the respondent management, I have received Rs. 150 as compensation and do not want to pursue the case. The statement is being made by me of my free-will and without any pressure. My reference may be filed".

In view of the above statement of the workman I answer the reference and give my award that the termination of services of the workman by the management was justified and in order and the workman is not entitled to any further relief.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Dated the 16th April, 1979.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. Ref. 28 of 1978/854, dated 20th September, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112) 3Lab-79/4582.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Grover Enterprises 1st. mile Narela Kundli road, Kundli (Sonapat).

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No 259 of 1978

between

SHRI PAL SINGH WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S GROWER  
ENTERPRISES 1ST. MILE NARELA KUNDLI ROAD, KUNDLI (SONEPAT).

Present :—

No one for the workman.

Shri Kanwal Singh for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/SPT/17/78/41195, dated 12th September, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Grover Enterprises 1st mile Narela Kundli road, Kundli (Sonapat) and its workmen Shri Pal Singh to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Pal Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The management appeared but the workman did not appear and notice was issued to summon the workman again for 5th January, 1979. The workman did not appear on 5th January, 1979 and Registered notices were issued for 7th March, 1979. On failure of the workman to appear Registered notice issued for 11th April, 1979. The acknowledgement receipt of the notice for 11th April, 1979 is placed on the file and in spite of service of notice no one on behalf of the workman has appeared. Right from the beginning neither the workman nor any authorised representative on his behalf is taking part in the proceedings before this court through numerous notices have been issued and served on the workman, I think the workman is no longer interested in pursuing his claim. He was not filed even his claim statement. In these circumstances I did miss this reference in default of the appearance of the workman and answer the same that the termination of



District	Tehsil	Locality/ Village	Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Rectangle/Killa No.
Ambala	Naraingarh	Hussani	308	2.94	<div style="text-align: center;"> <hr/> 19 <hr/> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> 22 — 27 </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 22 — 28 </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 22 — 30 </div> </div> 23 </div> <hr/> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> 9 — 1 </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 9 — 2 </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 12, 13, 18, </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 19 — 1 </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 19 — 2 </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 22, </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 23 — 1 </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 23 — 2 </div> </div> <div style="text-align: center;">34</div> <hr/> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> 2, 3, 8, 9, </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 12 — 1 </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 12 — 2 </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 13, 18, </div> </div> <div style="text-align: center;">34</div> <hr/> <div style="text-align: center;"> 19, 22, 23 </div>

District	Tehsil	Locality/ Village	Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Rectangle/Killa No.
					38
				$\frac{2}{3}$ , 3, 8, 9, $\frac{12}{3}$	13, 18, 19
				38	
				23	
				41, 70, 71, 174, 175	

The 20th April, 1979

No. SE/PWD/B&R/Ambala/574.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is pleased that land specified below is needed by the Government, at public expense, for public purpose, namely, for constructing Link road from Ambala Kalka road to village Fatehpur Tehsil Kalka District Ambala, it is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required for the aforesaid purpose.

This declaration is made under the provision of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern and under the provision of section 7 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition Collector, P. W. D., B. & R. Branch, Ambala Cantt. hereby directed to take orders for the acquisition of the said land.

Plans of the land may be inspected in the offices of the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch, Ambala Cantt. and the Executive Engineer, Provincial Division No. II, Chandigarh.

#### SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality/ Village	Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Rectangle/Killa No.
Ambala	Kalka	Fatehpur	367	2.11	5, 6
					20, 22/1, 22/2, 28, 15, 16
					8
					2, 3/1, 3/2, 3/3, 7/1, 7/2, 6/1,
					8
					6/2, 6/3, 8/1, 14, 15, 16/1, 16/2,
					8, 9
					17, 22, 38, 32, 20/1,
					9
					20/2

#### CORRIGENDUM

The 24th March, 1979

No. SE/PWD/B&R/Ambala/1115.—In partial modification of Notification No. SE/PWD/B&R/Ambala/1014, dated 9th March, 1977 published in *Haryana Government Gazette* on 22nd March, 1977, under section IV of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 for the work of construction of Storage Godown at Kalka in Ambala District, the name of village Kurar may be read as village Kurari.

(Sd.) . . . .,

Superintending Engineer,  
Ambala Circle, PWD., (B&R) Branch,  
Ambala Cantt.